

## **Remarks**

### Objection to the Specification

The Office Action notes that the list of references in the specification “is not a proper information disclosure statement.” The reference list was not intended to be an Information Disclosure Statement. Applicants listed references for the Examiner’s consideration in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on March 27, 2006.

### Objection to the Abstract

The Examiner objected to the abstract because it was not on a separate page. This amendment provides the abstract on a separate page.

### Objection to the Claims

The Examiner objected to the abbreviation “MGAT-X1,” and the abbreviation has been deleted from the claims.

### Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2

Claims 43, 45-47, 72, and 73 are rejected as indefinite because of the recitation “the complementary strand of which hybridizes under stringent conditions.” To advance prosecution, the claims are amended to delete this phrase. Please withdraw the rejection.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 1

Claim 46 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 1 because the recited host cell is not “isolated.” Claim 46 is amended to recite “an isolated host cell.” Please withdraw the rejection.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) and § 102(e)

Claims 43, 45-47, 72, and 73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(a) and 102(e) as anticipated by Gimeno (WO 03/053363). Gimeno does not disclose the subject matter of claims 43, 45-47, 72, or 73 as amended. Please withdraw the rejection.

Respectfully submitted,

**BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.**

/Lisa M. Hemmendinger/

Date: May 17, 2010

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Lisa M. Hemmendinger  
Registration No. 42,653

Customer No. 22907  
202-824-3000